

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/807,935		03/24/2004	William D. Denison	4800 P 009	5150
26971	7590	01/21/2005		EXAMINER	
JOSEPH M. KINSELLA JR. 311 S. WACKER DRIVE			ZIMMERMAN, BRIAN A		
53RD FLOO		VE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO,	IL 6060	6-6622	2635		

DATE MAILED: 01/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)						
	10/807,935	DENISON ET AL.						
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit						
	Brian A Zimmerman	2635						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).						
Status								
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	Responsive to communication(s) filed on .							
· _ · · · _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.							
	<u> </u>							
Disposition of Claims								
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 								
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	D) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment(s)								
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da							
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/04. 		te atent Application (PTO-152)						

Art Unit: 2635

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-29 of copending Application No. 10/807936. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims of this application are directed to method steps that correspond (in an obvious manner) to the apparatus claims of the copending application according to the chart that follows.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/807,935

Art Unit: 2635

This application (10/807935)	Copending application
	(10/807936)
1-3,7-9,12,13,15-17	1-4,9-11,15-18,20,23-26
4,14,20	6,12,19,27
5,10,18	7,13,21,28
6,11,19	5,8,14,22,29

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-4,6-9,11-17,19,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole (6130602) in addition to the admitted prior art.

O'Toole shows a method for deactivating (sleep) and enabling (wake) modes where the wake mode is extended when an electromagnetic signal is sensed. Such activity is considered switching and toggling between the two modes. See paragraph 48.

Another aspect of the invention provides a method for conserving power in a radio frequency identification device, the method comprising periodically switching from a

Application/Control Number: 10/807,935

Art Unit: 2635

sleep mode to a receiver on mode and performing the following tests to determine whether to further switch to a microprocessor on mode because a valid radio frequency signal is present: (a) determining if any radio frequency signal is present and, if so, proceeding to step (b); and, if not, returning to the sleep mode; and (b) determining if the radio frequency signal has a predetermined number of transitions per a predetermined time period of time and, if so, switching to the microprocessor on mode; and, if not, returning to the sleep mode.

O'Toole also shows the device used as an access key. See paragraphs 251,833-835.

- (251) It is sometimes desirable to prevent the integrated circuit 16 from responding to commands from an interrogator. For example, after communication with a particular device 12, it is sometimes desirable to prevent that particular device 12 from responding to a subsequent interrogation that is intended for a different device 12. If, for example, the device 12 is used in connection with an access gate, after an interrogator has read a badge containing the device 12 as a controlled access point is passed, the interrogator no longer has a need to communicate with that badge. The interrogator instead would want to pick up subsequent badges passing through the access gate. In addition, when the interrogator no longer has a need to communicate with a particular device 12, it is desirable that the device 12 stay in the sleep mode to conserve battery power.
- (833) The device 12 can be used for security purposes, to track personnel within a building. The device 12 can also be used for access control.
- (834) The device 12 can be used to monitor and manage freight transit. For example, interrogators 26 can be placed at the entrance and exit of a terminal (e.g., a rail or truck terminal), to monitor incoming and outgoing shipments of vehicles bearing the devices 12.
- (835) The device 12 can be used to impede car theft. A European anti-theft directive (74/61/EEC) provides that all new car models sold after January 1997 must be fitted with electronic immobilizers and approved alarm systems. The devices 12 can be provided on keychains or within car keys, and interrogators 26 placed in cars, so that the vehicle will be inoperable unless the specified device 12 for a specific car is used. The interrogator 26 can control the door locks of a car, or the ignition of the car, or both. Because the device 12 includes memory, the interrogator 26 in the car can periodically automatically change values in the device 12 (like changing a password).

Regarding the limitations of processing the incoming signal to retrieve an input code and comparing that to an access code to provide an unlock signal to move a solenoid, relay or motor. These are common steps in the process of using a wireless key to open a lock or gate, as evidenced by the applicant's

discussion of these steps and elements in paragraph 6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the common access system steps and elements set forth by the applicant to provide an access process for the O'Toole taught access control system since such would provide the necessary steps required to make O'Toole able to function as an access system as desired by O'Toole.

Page 5

3. Claims 5,10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Toole and the admitted prior art as applied to claims 1,8 and 15 above, and further in view of Stamm (4353064).

In an analogous art, Stamm shows the use of Infrared as an alternative electromagnetic signal (alternative to RF). This has the inherent advantage that the signal does not radiate outside a building and is therefore harder to eavesdrop.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used an infrared signal for communication in the above system since such would provide improved security to the access system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian A Zimmerman whose telephone number is 571-272-3059. The examiner can normally be reached on Off every other Friday.

Art Unit: 2635

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Horabik can be reached on 571-272-3068. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brian A Zimmerman Primary Examiner Art Unit 2635

BAZ